UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,260	07/06/2001	Toshikazu Higashi	018656-234	3456

7590   10/20/2009

Platon N. Mandros
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3684	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/899,260	HIGASHI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	JENNIFER LIVERSEDGE	3684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 July 2009*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for

reconsideration of application 09/899,260 filed on July 22, 2009.

The amendment contains previously presented claims: 4-14 and 17-20.

The amendment contains currently amended claims: 1-3 and 15-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1,

148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for

determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US Patent No. 7,075,666 B1 to Aiyama (further referred to as Aiyama), in

view of US Patent 6,938,154 B1 to Berson et al. (further referred to as Berson),

and further in view of US Patent 6,338,048 B1 to Mori (further referred to as

Mori).

Regarding claim 1, Aiyama discloses an information processing and

electronic payment method (columns 1-8) comprising the steps of:

Receiving at a printing system, through a network, data including both

processing data to be information-processed and electronic money data of an

electronic money issuer including an amount of electronic money that is

necessary for payment for information processing of said processing data (Figure

1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6, lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and

information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid (column 7,

lines 1-5 where a charge card number is received to determine if the presented

form of payment is valid and column 8, lines 4-7 where electronic money is also

collected for payment and it would be obvious that validating the electronic

money would also be performed as credit card validation is performed);

Making a request, by said printing system, to determine whether the

received electronic money data is valid or not (column 7, lines 1-5; column 8,

lines 6-7); and

When the received electronic money data is confirmed to be valid,

automatically starting the processing of the processing data to be information-

processed at said printing system (column 7, lines 1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the processing data and the electronic money data are attached together. However, Berson discloses wherein the processing data and the electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines 45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2, lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid. However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41;

column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as

disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit

card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer

card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the

card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information

received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while

Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification,

Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating

the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the

technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account

number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claim 2, Aiyama discloses an information processing method

(columns 1-8) comprising the steps of:

Receiving at a printing system, through a network, data to be information-

processed and electronic money data of an electronic money issuer including an

amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for information

processing of said processing data (Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6,

lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and information for determining whether the

electronic money data is valid (column 7, lines 1-5 where a charge card number

is received to determine if the presented form of payment is valid and column 8,

lines 4-7 where electronic money is also collected for payment and it would be

obvious that validating the electronic money would also be performed as credit

card validation is performed);

Relating, at said printing system, the received data to be information-

processed with the electronic money data by which payment for information is

made (Figure 4; column 6, lines 10-39; column 7, lines 1-8; column 8, lines 6-7);

Making a request, by said printing system, to determine whether the

received electronic money data is valid or not (column 7, lines 1-5; column 8,

lines 6-7); and

When the received electronic money data is confirmed to be valid,

automatically starting the processing of the processing data to be information-

processed at the printing system (column 7, lines 1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the data to be information-

processed and the electronic money data are attached together. However,

Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the

electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital

cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines

45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2,

lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is

used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network

device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print

services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is

decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment

by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the

use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by

Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information

processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the

information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an

encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and

printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the

electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid.

However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for

determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 –

column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41;

column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as

disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit

card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer

card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the

card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information

received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while

Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification,

Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating

the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the

technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account

number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claim 3, Aiyama discloses an electronic payment method

(columns 1-8) comprising the steps of:

Receiving at a printing system, through a network, data to be information-

processed and electronic money data of an electronic money issuer including an

amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for information

processing of said processing data (Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6,

lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and information for determining whether the

electronic money data is valid (column 7, lines 1-5 where a charge card number

is received to determine if the presented form of payment is valid and column 8,

lines 4-7 where electronic money is also collected for payment and it would be

obvious that validating the electronic money would also be performed as credit

card validation is performed);

Associating, at said printing system, the data to be information-processed

with the electronic money data by which payment for information-processing is

made (Figure 4; column 6, lines 10-39; column 7, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 6-7);

Making a request, by said printing system, to determine whether the

received electronic money data is valid or not (column 7, lines 1-5; column 8,

lines 6-7); and

When the received electronic money data is confirmed to be valid,

automatically starting the processing of the processing data which is associated

with the validated electronic money data at said printing system (column 7, lines

1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the data to be information-

processed and the electronic money data are attached together. However,

Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the

electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital

cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines

45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2,

lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is

used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network

device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print

services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is

decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment

by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the

use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by

Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information

processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the

information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an

encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and

printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the

electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid.

However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for

determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 –

column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41;

column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as

disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit

card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer

card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the

card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information

received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while

Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification,

Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating

the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the

technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account

number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claim 4, Aiyama discloses a system for making payment by electronic money (columns 1-8) comprising:

A user side subsystem including a user's terminal (Figures 1 and 4),

An electronic money issuer side subsystem including an electronic money issuing server (Figure 4), and

A processor side subsystem including a data processor that performs a processing based on processing request data from the user (Figures 1 and 4),

Wherein the user side subsystem, the electronic money issuer side subsystem and the processor side subsystem are connected to one another through a network (Figure 4),

Wherein the user side subsystem transmits both the processing request data and electronic money data of the electronic money issuer including an amount of electronic money issued by the electronic money issuer side subsystem that is necessary for payment for processing of the processing request data (Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6, lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid (column 7, lines 1-5 where a charge card number is received to determine if the presented form of payment is valid and column 8, lines 4-7 where electronic money is also collected for payment and it would be obvious that validating the electronic money would also be performed as credit card validation is performed);

The processor side subsystem transmits the electronic money data to the electronic money issuer side subsystem (column 6, lines 10-67; column 7, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 6-7);

The electronic money issuer side system determines whether the electronic money data is valid or not (column 7, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 6-7); and

The processor side subsystem performs the processing based on the processing request data in accordance with a result of the electronic money data validation and transmits a request for payment for the processing to the electronic money issuer side subsystem (column 6, lines 10-67; column 7, lines 1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the data to be information-processed and the electronic money data are attached together. However, Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines 45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2, lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the

use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by

Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information

processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the

information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an

encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and

printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the

electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid.

However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for

determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 –

column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41;

column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as

disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit

card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer

card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the

card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information

received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while

Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification,

Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating

the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the

technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account

number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claims 5-6, Aiyama discloses an electronic money processor

(columns 1-8) comprising:

A receiving member which receives both processing request data

transmitted from a user through a network and based on which a processing

requested by the user is executed and electronic money data of an electronic

money issuer transmitted from the user through the network and including an

amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for processing said

processing request data and issued by an electronic money issuer (Figure 1;

column 3, lines 52-61; column 6, lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and

information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid (column 7,

lines 1-5 where a charge card number is received to determine if the presented

form of payment is valid and column 8, lines 4-7 where electronic money is also

collected for payment and it would be obvious that validating the electronic

money would also be performed as credit card validation is performed);

A memory in which the processing request data received by the receiving

member is stored (Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-61);

A transmitter which transmits the electronic money data received by the

receiving member to the electronic money issuer to check whether the electronic

money data is valid or not (Figure 4; column 6, lines 10-67; column 7, lines 1-5;

column 8, lines 6-7); and

An execution controller which controls execution of the processing based

on the processing request data corresponding to the electronic money data and

stored in the memory in accordance with a result of the check of validity of the

electronic money data (column 7, lines 1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the data to be information-

processed and the electronic money data are attached together. However,

Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the

electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital

cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines

45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2,

lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is

used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network

device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print

services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is

decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment

by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the

use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by

Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information

processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the

information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an

encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid. However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41; column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification, Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claim 7, Aiyama discloses an image forming apparatus comprising the electronic money processor as claimed in claim 5 (see rejection to claim 5 above), further comprising:

An image forming portion in which execution of the processing is based on the control of the processing request data by the execution control means of the electronic money processor (column 7, lines 1-16).

Regarding claim 8, Aiyama discloses an image forming apparatus comprising:

A receiving member which receives both print data transmitted from a user through a network and electronic money data of an electronic money issuer corresponding to the print data transmitted from the user through the network and including an amount of electronic money issued by an electronic money issuer that is necessary for payment for processing said print data (Figure 1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6, lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid (column 7, lines 1-5 where a charge card number is received to determine if the presented form of payment is valid and column 8, lines 4-7 where electronic money is also collected for payment and it would be obvious that validating the electronic money would also be performed as credit card validation is performed);

A transmitter which transmits the electronic money data received by the receiving member to the electronic money issuer to check whether the electronic

money data is valid or not (Figure 4; column 6, lines 10-67; column 7, lines 1-5;

column 8, lines 6-7); and

An image forming portion which processes the print data in accordance

with a result of the check of validity of the electronic money data (column 7, lines

1-16).

Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the data to be information-

processed and the electronic money data are attached together. However,

Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the

electronic money data are attached together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital

cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines

45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2,

lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is

used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network

device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print

services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is

decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment

by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the

use of attaching the processing data and electronic money as disclosed by

Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information

processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the

information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an

encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and printing.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid. However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41; column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification, Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claims 9-14, Aiyama does not specifically disclose wherein the processing data and electronic money are attached together in a data packet including header information and print control command. However, Berson discloses wherein the data to be information-processed and the electronic money are attached together in a data packet including header information and print control command (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital cash along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines 45-51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2, lines 32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is used to enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network device; column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print services where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is decoupled in order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment by digital cash which was sent with the document over the network). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the use of attaching the processing data and electronic money in a data packet including header information and print control command as disclosed by Berson with the mechanism of accepting electronic money for information processing as disclosed by Aiyama. The motivation would be to associate the information to be processed and the electronic money to pay for it in an encrypted packet for association through the process of sending, paying and printing.

Regarding claim 15, Aiyama discloses an information processing method

(columns 1-8) comprising the steps of:

Receiving at a printing system, through a network, job data including

processing data to be information-processed and electronic money data of an

electronic money issuer including an amount of electronic money that is

necessary for payment for information processing of said processing data (Figure

1; column 3, lines 52-61; column 6, lines 10-39; column 8, lines 6-7) and

information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid (column 7,

lines 1-5 where a charge card number is received to determine if the presented

form of payment is valid and column 8, lines 4-7 where electronic money is also

collected for payment and it would be obvious that validating the electronic

money would also be performed as credit card validation is performed);

Making a request at said printing system, to determine whether the

electronic money data is valid (column 7, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 6-7); and

When the received electronic money data is confirmed to be valid,

automatically starting the processing of the processing data to be information-

processed at said printing system (column 7, lines 1-16; column 8, lines 6-7).

Aiyama does not disclose separating processing data and the electronic

money data. However, Berson discloses where processing data and electronic

money data are received together (column 6, lines 54-60 where digital cash

along with a document are sent over a network for services; column 1, lines 45-

51 where encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; column 2, lines

32-60 and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is used to

enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network device; column

6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print services where

the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is decoupled in order to

process the encrypted documents in between for payment by digital cash which

was sent with the document over the network) and wherein a portion of that data

is decrypted for operation of the network device (column 2, lines 37-60; column

4, lines 26-49). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to adapt the separation of the processing information and the

electronic money data as disclosed by Berson with the processing of information

processing data and validation of payment by electronic payment as disclosed by

Aiyama. The motivation would be that though the data are received together,

different portions of the data require different validation methods and therefore

need to be separated to accommodate the validation.

Neither Aiyama nor Berson disclose receiving information on the

electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid.

However, Mori discloses receiving information on the electronic money issuer for

determining if the electronic money is valid (Figures 4, 5, 6, 8; column 5, line 66 –

column 6, line 4; column 6, lines 24-27 and lines 45-46; column 8, lines 40-41;

column 11, lines 32-45; column 12, line 61 – column 13, line 6) It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

use of validation of credit card or electronic money as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt the receipt of issuer information as

disclosed by Mori. The motivation would be that, as disclosed by Mori, a credit

card account number or electronic account number as displayed on a customer

card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up. Therefore, when the

card account input in various ways as known in the art, part of the information

received through that data is an identification of the issuer. Therefore, while

Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of an issuer identification,

Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account number and then validating

the transaction and it would be obvious that Aiyama would be using the

technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field in that the account

number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Regarding claims 16-20, Aiyama does not disclose where the processing

request data and the electronic money data are designated by a group identifier

common to both the processing request data and the electronic money data to

allow separate processing of the processing request data and the electronic

money data. However, Berson discloses where the processing request data and

the electronic money data are designated by a group identifier common to both

the processing request data and the electronic money data to allow separate

processing of the processing request data and the electronic money data

(column 1, lines 45-51; column 2, lines 56-60; column 4, lines 28-35column 6,

lines 54-60). Given the combination of Aiyama and Berson above which

provides for the printing by payment with electronic money where the processing

information and electronic money are received together as disclosed by the

combination of Aiyama and Berson to adapt a group identifier for the two pieces

of information and wherein the information can be separated for processing as further disclosed by Berson. The motivation would be that processing information to be printed and payment information to be validated required different processing methods and therefore, though they come attached, they need to be separated for processing, as disclosed by Berson.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/22/2009 related to the 112 and 101 rejections have been considered and are found to be persuasive. The amendments as presented have prompted the withdrawing of the 101 rejection as the novel steps have been tied to a particular machine or apparatus. The 112 rejections have been withdrawn as applicant has pointed to the sections of the specification which clarify the language as set forth in the claims.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/22/2009 have been fully considered but, with respect to the prior art of record and the 103 rejection, they are not persuasive.

First, applicant argues the validity of a Final Office Action, stating that previously set forth arguments were not addressed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In the previous Amendment and Arguments/Remarks, claim limitations related to an "electronic money issuer" were added and then the arguments related to "processing data and electronic money are attached together" were established in the context and same sentence as the "electronic money issuer". The scope of the claim was modified, and the arguments were

set forth with respect to this new scope and therefore the claim limitations were

not addressed independent of each other as that was not how they were

presented in the arguments. Applicant points to the Remarks submitted on

12/1/2008 on page 13 where the concept of the "electronic money issuer" and

"processing data and electronic money are attached together" and it is this

section to which with the amendments were made, and thus the scope of the

claim with these amendments were addressed in the Office Action and not

addressed in the Response to Arguments because the concept of "processing

data and electronic money are attached together" was not argued alone but in

the context of the amended claims.

　　　　With or without the amendment, examiner contends that Berson is proper

in teaching the claim limitations as set forth in the Office Action rejection above.

Berson discloses wherein the processing data and the electronic money data are

attached together in column 6, lines 54-60 where digital cash along with a

document are sent over a network for services; in column 1, lines 45-51 where

encrypted data are inserted into a packet in a header; in column 2, lines 32-60

and column 4, lines 28-49 where the encrypted digital certificate is used to

enforce usage policies and command for operation of the network device; and in

column 6, lines 54-60 where the usage policies include payment of print services

where the time a document is sent and the time it is processed is decoupled in

order to process the encrypted documents in between for payment by digital

cash which was sent with the document over the network.

Applicant further argues the use of Mori as analogous art, and contends

that Mori teaches away from the claimed invention. Examiner notes that "The

prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a

teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not

criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed..." In re Fulton,

391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). From MPEP §

2141.02 Section VI. Mori does not discredit or criticize receiving information on

the electronic money issuer for determining if the electronic money is valid. As

noted above, it is old and well known in the field of electronic commerce to

receive credit card information by various means, such as through presentation

of a physical card, by oral presentation to a customer service representative over

the phone, via entering data over an Internet connection, etc. As disclosed by

Mori, a credit card account number or electronic account number as displayed on

a customer card includes the issuer as part of the numerical make-up.

Therefore, when the card account information is input in various ways as known

in the art, part of the information received through that data is an identification of

the issuer. Therefore, while Aiyama does not specifically disclose the receipt of

an issuer identification, Aiyama does disclose receiving a credit card account

number and then validating the transaction; and it would be obvious that Aiyama

would be using the technique as disclosed by Mori and as well known in the field

in that the account number indicates the issuer to contact for validation.

Therefore, Examiner contends that Mori does not teach away from the claimed

invention and represents proper analogous art in combination with Aiyama and

Berson.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer

Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at 571-272-6702. The fax

number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

/Jennifer Liversedge/

Examiner, Art Unit 3684